

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claim 16 contains allowable subject matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 12-14, 17, 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,741,554 issued to D'Amico et al. ("D'Amico").

Claim 12 requires, in part, "allocating a unique identifying frequency to each of a plurality of radio transmitters and radio receivers..." The Examiner points to col. 7, lines 21-33 of D'Amico for its alleged teaching of this feature. However, col. 7, lines 21-33 teaches that carrier frequencies are assigned to one or more wireless devices on a time-periodic basis. The frequency is divided into time slots which are then shared by one or more wireless devices. Thus, D'Amico does not teach or suggest "allocating a unique identifying frequency to each of a plurality of radio transmitters and radio receivers" as required in claim 12.

Claim 12 also requires, in part, "performing frequency-slot separation on to-be-repeated data packets if the repeat time slot is detected, wherein the frequency-slot separation assigns the to-be-repeated data packets to a respective unique identifying frequency." The Examiner argues that D'Amico teaches this feature in col. 11, lines 29-53 in the context of a rescue rescue channel used for retransmission data. However, a single rescue channel may be selected for communications with all the wireless devices, or more than one rescue channel may be selected to support communications with the devices. See col. 8, lines 61-66. Therefore, an allocation of a unique identifying frequency is not disclosed, and D'Amico does not teach or suggest the required claim limitation.

Claim 12 also recites, in part, "the frequency-slot separation is carried out *within the duration of the repeat time slot.*" (emphasis added) The Examiner argues that col. 7, lines 29-53 of D'Amico teaches that the rescue channel is used for retransmission data; the Examiner does not even address the portion of the recited feature, "within the duration of the repeat time slot." No portion of D'Amico, cited by the Examiner or otherwise, discloses or makes obvious "performing frequency-slot separation on to-be-repeated data packets if the repeat time slot is detected, ... wherein the frequency-slot separation is carried out within the duration of the repeat time slot" as required in claim 12.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over D'Amico. Claims 13-14, 17, 18, and 21 depend from Claim 12 and thus are also in a condition for allowance.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amico in view of U.S. Patent 5,896,375 issued to Dent et al. ("Dent"). The Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art combinations, even if proper, which the Applicant does not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amico in view of U.S. Patent 5,864,755 issued to King et al. ("King"). The Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art combinations, even if proper, which the Applicant does not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

Claims 15, 19, 20, and 22 depend from claim 12. Although the Applicant makes no concessions regarding claims 15, 19, 20, and 22, the Applicant submits that claims 15, 19, 20, and 22 for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 12.

#### Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement

Applicant(s) : Frank Exeler  
Serial No. : 10/563,527  
Filed : January 3, 2006  
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney Docket No.: 3A001-006001  
Client Ref. No.: GD 44006/DS

with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 3A001-006001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/8/09

  
Mandy Jubang  
Reg. No. 45,884

Customer No. 69713  
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP  
10 Fawcett Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Telephone: (617) 500-2504  
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499  
116909.doc